

REMARKS

Claims 121-124, 126-129, 132-144, and 146-158 are pending, with claims 121, 135, 139, and 148 being independent. Claims 1-120, 125, 130, 131 and 145 were previously cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer, and Applicant reserves the right to pursue these claims in this or related applications. By virtue of this amendment, claims 121-124, 126-129, 132-138 are amended, new claims 148-158 are added, and no new matter is included in these amendments.

Applicant thanks Supervisory Examiner Kramer for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview with Applicant's representative that occurred on August 14, 2007.

Applicant believes that this amendment reflects the substance of the interview.

Claims 121-124, 126-129, 132-144, and 146-147 were subjected to a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. 121 mailed May 18, 2007. Applicant respectfully submits that the restriction requirement is at best confusing, for example, in referring to an "apparatus (system)" for Group I (Restriction Requirement, Page 2, line 14), which refers to a "computer program product" (Restriction Requirement, Page 2, line 5), in referring to "method claims" for Group II (Restriction Requirement, Page 2, line 15), which refers to an "apparatus" (Restriction Requirement, Page 2, line 7), and in referring to "the process" for Group I (Restriction Requirement, Page 2, line 16), which refers to a "computer program product" (Restriction Requirement, Page 2, line 5).

Further, the Restriction Requirement (Page 2, lines 17-18) states, "second subjective information parameter described in III is not included in II." However, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 135 (listed by the Restriction Requirement in Group II) recites "one or more subjective information parameters."

After discussion of the restriction requirement with Applicant's representative, Supervisory Examiner Kramer agreed that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn, and that there would be no need for Applicant to elect one of Groups I, II, or III in the present response to the outstanding Restriction Requirement.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the outstanding restriction requirement. Applicant further respectfully requests a new non-final Office Action or a Notice of Allowance for the present application.

Conclusion

Based on the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all of claims 121-124, 126-129, 132-144, 146-158 are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (202-570-6454) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3521.

Respectfully submitted,

Brake Hughes Bellermann LLP
Customer No. 53666
Phone 202-570-6454

Date August 20, 2007

By _____
Margo Livesay, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 41,946

